district court of the United States for the Middle district

Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk, natural person third party

RECEIVED SCRANTON

Case No.

Petitioner,

JAN 2 5 2001 The Court is requested to

'versus'

A ULERAKe judicial notice of this DEPUTY CLANGE ion. SCRANTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent,

JAN 3 0 2001

Motion For Court To Answer Jurisdictional Question

Petitioner, Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk, by Special Visitation, moves this Honorable district court of the United States for Pennsylvania, to answer the Jurisdictional question herein presented.

Does Petitioner's Claims, asserted therein his petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Relief, present a "case or controversy" within the Meaning of Article III, § 2, cl. 1 of the Constitution of the United States (c. March 4, Anno domini 1789)?:

- 1. Did the Court lack personal jurisdiction over Petitioner, where Petitioner is not amenable to the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of America?
- 2. Was Petitioner's Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Amendment Right, and Thirteenth Amendment Constitutional protection violated where Respondent used private law; (i.e., 84 Stat. 1260 and 84 Stat. 1265, codified at 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a), 846, to obtain conviction against Petitioner ?
- 3. Was Petitioner's Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Ninth Amendment Con-

stitutional Rights violated where Respondent used unpromulgated regulatory statutes [ex vi termini], 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a), 846, to obtain conviction against Petitioner?

- 4. Did the Court lack subject matter jurisdiction, and personal jurisdiction over Petitioner, to try and convict Petitioner for unpromulgated regulatory statutes, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a), 846 ?
- 5. Can Respondent fail to adhere to the mandates of 49 Stat. 500, codified at 44 U.S.C. § 1505(a); 80 Stat. 379, codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552; Executive Order 11030, and 84 Stat. 1245, codified at 21 U.S.C. § 811 ? and if not can Petitioner be adversely affected by the regulations therefrom ?
- 6. Is the guarantee of due process of law, Fifth, Sixth Amendment Rights of the Federal Constitution, waived where Petitioner, labored under fraudulent concealment of material facts, and does that same waiver remove the right to trial by jury at common?
- 7. Did Congress exceed its Constitutionally enumerated exercise of power in violation of Article IV, § 3, cl. 1 of the Constitution, by the erection of its agency and/or federal state; (i.e., UNITED STATES OF AMERICA), into the jurisdiction of the several State of Maryland, causing the deprivation of Petitioner's Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Ninth Amendment Federal Constitutional Rights?
- 8. Is Petitioner actually innocent of the conviction, as it currently stands, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a), 846 ?

I have the honor to remain,

Dated this 22 day of Voncou

Anno domini 2001.

Sincere,

Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk c/o Post Office Box [1000]

Lewisburg; near [17837], Pennsylvania

Certificate of Service

I, Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk, hereby affirm and attest, that [t]he forgoing "verified" by Oath of Affirmation, Writ of Habeas Corpus, with pen in hand signature, accompanied by (4) motions and Clerk's cover letter, was served upon the below named:

by placing same into the mail receptacle at [USP] Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, via (Certified Return Receipt for Merchandise), article number, (7099 3220 0008 0487 3936), on this <u>13</u> day of <u>Vanuary</u> Anno domini 2001.

I have the honor to remain, Sincere.

Corey Lofenzo Woodfolk

c/o Post Office Box [1000],

Lewisburg; near [17837],

Pennsylvania

FILED SCRANTON

JAN 3 0 20/07

CEPUTY CLERK